IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Crl.M.No.35854-M of 2006.
Date of Decision: 19.01.2007.

Santosh Kumari

..... Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL.

Present:- Mr.KS Dadwal,Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr.NS Gill, AAG Punjab.
Mr.GPS Bal,Advocate for the complainant.

*****

Petitioner Santosh Kumar, apprehending her arrest in a non-bailable offence in case FIR No.30 dated 14.5.2006 under Sections 304-B IPC, registered at PS Hajipur, District Hoshiarpur has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for the grant of anticipatory bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the contents of the FIR as well as the order dated 7.6.2006, passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Hoshiarpur, whereby pre-arrest bail application moved by the petitioner was dismissed.

In this case, marriage of the deceased was performed on 3.2.2006 with co-accused named Suresh Kumar son of the petitioner. Within three months of the marriage, shed died unnatural death. Thereupon, the aforesaid FIR was registered. At the time of issuance of notice of motion, a contention was raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the deceased was having illicit relations with one boy of the village, who had also committed suicide after 10 days of the death of the deceased. In this regard a copy of the DDR, Annexure P-6, was also placed on record.

Counsel for the respondent State submits that the said DDR has nothing to do with the present offence. That was a separate incident in

which a boy had committed suicide, having no relation with the deceased. Counsel contends that at no point of time, any complaint was made by the family of that boy that he was having illicit relations with the deceased daughter-in-law of the complainant. Therefore, I do not find any substance in the said contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner. There are specific allegations against the petitioner for demand of dowry and undisputedly, the deceased died an unnatural death within three months of her marriage. In my opinion, no case for the grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

19.1.2007. **(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)**
rpj **JUDGE**